

### REMARKS

Applicant is herewith filing an RCE to have the amendments and remarks included in the Response filed on February 14, 2007 considered. Additionally, Applicant submits the following Remarks in response to the Office Action mailed on March 14, 2007.

The Office Action states that U.S. Patent No. 5,656,330 ("Niiyama") and the present application refer to the same element, an element capable of emitting a flux of electrons from the surface of an element through open space, by different names. The Office Action states that Niiyama refers to this element as an "emitter" while the present application refers to it as a "current emitter." The Office Action then explains that because these terms are different, the term "current emitter" must be given its broadest reasonable interpretation, which, according to past Office Actions, is any element that conducts electricity.

Applicants respectfully disagree with these statements. Both Niiyama and the present application use the word "emitter" to describe a similar element, i.e. an element capable of emitting a flux of electrons from the surface of an element through open space, thus showing the term is known and understood in the art. The fact that the present application includes the word "current" before the word "emitter" does not prove that the term is not an ordinary term in the art, and further, does not justify the Office Action's unreasonable interpretation of the phrase as including any element that conducts electricity.

Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

David T. Beck

Registration No.: 54,985

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant